Rt. 7, Frederick, Md. 21701

11/28/67

Dear Mr. Durkin,

Page 82 of C in W.O. has an error I cannot excuse but I do apologize for it. I am certain it is 100% my fault. The name should not be Paul Fiazza, the young man I mention elsewhere who was in the CAP youth but that of Oswald's cousin Murret. Unfortunately, the Warren index is to only the testimony and has been edited there, as per the cases I cite. The exhibits the Commission did not index. If you look in Volume 26, about page 200 (and there may be some ahead of here) you will find samples of Oswald's anti-communism. I also have quotations of his writing, etc., in WHITEWASH (original edition) at the beginning of chapter 10. If you want it, I also have a Commission document in which he is quoted by the New Orleans police on his arrest August 9, 1963, as calling the Russians "lousy, stinking politicians". Sorry I do not have time to look up the citation, but you will find an abundance in the exhibits. In fact, there are quotations of his anti-communism in the Report itself. The FBI made an exhaustive check and could find no single case of Oswald engaging in any Communist activity, having any Communist or left-wing associations of any kind. There is only his slef-serving letters which in themselves show he was not sincere.

Oswald In New Orleans was written pursuant to an agreement with a major publisher which called for delivery of the completed manuscript in April. I mailed all 200,000 words about the middle of the month. The ribbon copy was not delivered. The chain of events that followed caused a delay of about 6 weeks. The publisher then declined the book, giving no reason. My agent tried without success in those heady equipped to bring it out rapidly, which runs the cost up considerably. My original deal called for delivery of the rough draft. The publisher was to edit. I returned to other work, as you are, to a degree, aware (my fifth book has been written for some time now). Finally, my agent made the arrangement with Canyon. I was then too busy to go over the galleys and their editor was in need of surgery. I asked them to not polish the book as a writer ordinarily would prefer because I believe rapid publication essential. I believe this subject involves the integrity of our reality as no other has in my lifetime and that for it to function, the people must have access to information. They asked me to write an introduction setting forth the history of the book and explaining its roughness. I returned home and did it immediately, sending the rough draft almost by return mail. I suppose because the book was already too long (I see traces of scissors editing in various places), they cut it, I think injudiciously and unwisely. However, because I did not have time to go over everything carefully myself I told them I'd leave the editing up to them so long as they made no change in fact or doctrine. Hence, although I never saw what had happened to the Prologue until I saw the bound book, the ultimate responsibility for what does not satisfy me is my own. Reference was to editing that would take a very long time, particularly for a small publisher. I also have seen no ads for it, but that was not the subject of the reference. I very much want to see ads!

When all of this mess is washed out, I think you will agree that I also have no intention of and have not smeared the Commission. If you read my work carefully, like the introduction to the first book and the epilogue to the second, you will find that I alone among those called "critics" defend the integrity of the members. I have the most serious doubts of the judgement displayed by all, from Warren to Ford....Much of the writing I have seen and more of the speaking reflects not fact but the political preconceptions of the authors, who try and accomodate reality to these pre-existing beliefs. I encourage you to avoid this. In a young writer the risk is greater. Consider instead what the facts themselves mean, not as seen through left or right eyes. Whether you agree with me or not is not really material, but be certain your writing conforms to reality.

It also is necessary to decide whether all the available information on any aspect of the case was a) considered by the Commission and b) properly evaluated. If there is evidence that was not considered, does not the mere fact of its being ignored have significance?

Remember also, that we have not reached the end. Most thinking and writing is frozen in the mold of the past. This makes writing easier, for one can draw upon the other and the 26 volumes can be pretended to be complete and final. Alas, they are not. I wish I though that with the great amount of time I have spent in the files I had really plumbed them. So, your writing today may be judged alongside what is public knowledge months hence and of which you today have no inkling. Not only is my fifth book written, but my sixth is a third done (its appendix, more extensive than that of CHGTOWN, is done), and my seventh is researched. If you examine what you have seen since I completed WHITEWASH in February 1965, you will see that little has been added to its content by subsequent writing. All my subsequent writing, however, does bring new things to light. I wish the books not appearing and with influential commercial sponsorship did have the new material that was available to the writers. I deplore the cheap schemes xxxx concocted to make books salable.

Whether or not you believe me or my interpretations, I tell you that you can look forward to major revelations from inside the Commission and that they are entirely consistent with what I have said. I have perhaps 2,000 pages of the once-secret documents.

Again, I apologize for the haste. My days are too long and there is then not enough time. I hope I have adequately answered your questions and that you properly understand what I have volunteered. All of us who write on this subject will have to stand on what we have written. The wrong words and the wrong opinions can plague a writer for years.

In the course of taking a last-minute check through this in an effort to save you time, I find that my error on Piazza had a basis. Check pp.2 344-5. You'll find the hate of Communism in Exhibit 89 (423ff)x.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg